



## DIGITAL SURVEILLANCE AND INTERNALIZED CONTROL: READING THE EVERY THROUGH FOUCAULT AND ZUBOFF

**Sami Ul Haq**

M.Phil. English Literature, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan  
[sami27664@gmail.com](mailto:sami27664@gmail.com)

**Taimur Khan**

M.Phil. English Literature, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan  
[taimurkhanscholar@gmail.com](mailto:taimurkhanscholar@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*This paper examines *The Every* by Dave Eggers as a critical narrative of technological surveillance and its psychological implications in the digital age. The primary aim of the study is to investigate how corporate surveillance practices, driven by surveillance capitalism and panoptic power, shape human behavior, agency, and mental autonomy. Drawing on Shoshana Zuboff's theory of surveillance capitalism and Michel Foucault's concept of the panoptic gaze, the research employs a qualitative, interpretivist, and hermeneutic methodology. Using Greenham's six-layered close reading approach, the study analyzes the commodification of emotions, relationships, and behavioral patterns as data assets. The findings reveal that pervasive algorithmic surveillance leads to psychological manipulation, erosion of individual agency, and normalization of behavioral conformity. By contextualizing Delaney's fate within a broader socio-psychological framework, the thesis demonstrates how digital dependency restructures human experience and mental health under contemporary surveillance regimes.*

**Keywords:** Surveillance Capitalism, Panoptic Gaze, Psychological Manipulation, Digital Surveillance, Dave Eggers, Technological Power

### Research Objective

To analyze Dave Eggers' *The Every* portrays the psychological and behavioral impacts of technological surveillance on individuals.

### INTRODUCTION

Over the years, almost all human life has been greatly affected by modern technology. Technology is so dominant that we scarcely cannot notice it. In the tech era, especially at the speed of lightning, people are more than device users; it seems that they are becoming defined by them.

The definition of harnessing technology focuses on the structured and systematic nature of technology, while bringing to light its role in forming the function and interaction of societal dynamics in the world.

According to Galbraith (1967) "Technology means the systematic application of scientific or other organized knowledge to practical tasks. Its most important consequence, at least for the purposes of economics, is in forcing the division and subdivision of any such task into its component parts. Thus, and only thus, can organized knowledge be brought to bear on performance?" (p. 14).

Firstly, technology leaves its mark on all sectors of present-day existence. Individuals use technology to manage their relationships in their personal lives. Real-world evidence shows that people want to preserve connections yet despise situations of disconnection. According to Carr (2010), "We like to feel connected and we hate to feel disconnected. The Internet doesn't change our intellectual habits against our will. But change them it does".(p. 88).

Secondly, on a societal scale, technology enables progress through innovation together with worldwide network capabilities and cultural dialogue. Individuals now easily exchange messages across great distances and complete joint work while obtaining an extensive variety of information due to technology as Castells (1996) explained network society "Networks constitute the new social morphology of our societies, and the diffusion of networking logic substantially modifies the operation and outcomes in processes of production, experience, power, and culture." (p. 500). According to this system, Technology serves as the fundamental

foundation of this present-day social framework. The social structure shows characteristics that combine interconnected information systems with worldwide networks. Digital platforms and the internet have transformed individual methods of data retrieval relationship creation and commercial interactions.

Technological advancement is inherently related to surveillance powers, and it is an enabler for sophisticated surveillance systems. Knowing how to apply cutting technologies is what's needed to monitor the very people who create and sell cutting technologies, and the social media platforms, workplace monitoring software, and facial recognition systems all help reinforce the mechanisms of power and the mechanisms of control.

### **Technological Surveillance**

The first step in the use of surveillance systems was to be used for monitoring, but the systems have evolved further and have been modified with the implementation of AI-driven image recognition capabilities. This surveillance platform detects specific behaviors in addition to generating forecasts about impending human activities. Such technologies market themselves as tools to enhance security and order but their integration creates discomfort in public minds because people experience continuous observation. The extensive surveillance system creates a social environment where individuals conform to their behavior through both voluntary and involuntary adoption of societal rules.

---

<sup>1</sup> Galbraith, J. K. (1967). *The new industrial state*. Houghton Mifflin.

<sup>2</sup> Carr, N. (2010). *The shallows: What the internet is doing to our brains*. W. W. Norton & Company.

<sup>3</sup> Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Blackwell.

### **Digital Surveillance**

Digital surveillance utilizes computer and telecommunication technologies to specifically monitor online behavior in a systematic and intrusive manner via connected devices, and digital platforms. It is drawn on technological surveillance.

According to Marx (2016) "The new surveillance not only reveals the hidden; it often is of low visibility or is invisible. It is more likely to be involuntary. The data collection of the new surveillance is often integrated into routine activity or may be a byproduct of it (rather than being the main goal). It is also more likely to be automated, involving machines, than (or in addition to) manual, involving humans. It is relatively inexpensive per unit of data collected, and it is often mediated through remote means rather than on scene, with data residing with third parties and beyond." (p. 56). Digital surveillance differs from classic surveillance in that it is more based on metadata analysis, cookies, and algorithmic profiling. According to Deibert (2013) "Securing cyberspace requires a reinforcement, rather than a relaxation, of restraint on

power, including checks and balances on governments, law enforcement, intelligence agencies, and on the private sector. In an environment of big data, in which so much personal information is entrusted to third parties, oversight mechanisms on government agencies and involved corporations are essential.” (pp. 230-231)

### **Internal Struggles in a Surveillance-Driven Society**

Surveillance in particular inspires the spontaneous internal struggle and policing. The psychological and emotional responses to being looked upon is where the trouble is born. They are the most obvious internal conflicts: loss of autonomy, folly of personal privacy. But some places are as fully surveilled as people are always speculating as to what they can do, say, or even think. Another way of putting it is that, in this phenomenon, I cannot help but think of Foucault's concept of the panopticon, due to the self-regulation and standardization of behaviors that result from being under constant observation. That makes people subject to this fear of exposure, of lack of control of their own data and behavior. (Foucault, 1977)

### **External Struggles in a Surveillance-Driven Society**

Deibert (2013) "All of the data about us as individuals in social network communities is owned, operated, managed, and manipulated by third parties beyond our control, and those third parties are, typically, private companies" (P. 71). Having a power dynamic that facilitates mistrust between citizens and institutions in the name of surveillance, which then becomes weaponized, resulting in dissent suppression and marginalization of certain communities, or simply influencing public behavior in any way qualifies.

---

<sup>4</sup> Marx, G. T. (2016). *Windows into the soul: Surveillance and society in an age of high technology*. University of Chicago Press.

<sup>5</sup>Deibert, R. J. (2013). *Black code: Surveillance, privacy, and the dark side of the Internet*. Signal.

<sup>6</sup> Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

### **Commodification of Behavior & Corporate Exploitation of Users**

Zuboff (2019) as laid out brilliantly in her thought-provoking work *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, is the other main critical framework which the current study is applying. It discusses how contemporary surveillance mechanisms always move beyond observation and systematically cash in on personal data. In this context, large companies and corporations keep generating huge amounts of personal behavioral data to forecast and direct human actions as if they were goods. By taking place, Zuboff explains this process compromises personal autonomy by having algorithms nudge one to choose through targeted advertising and subtle nudges.

Technological surveillance is highly ethical and psychologically problematic. Today, surveillance has become ubiquitous and has significantly changed modern society. In the meantime, supporters of surveillance will claim that it is beneficial. However, as Lyon (2018) notes, "Yet, because there may be apparent benefits of some kinds of surveillance and because it is so hard to know how some kinds of seemingly trivial data – birdseed? – could possibly make a difference, there is relatively little outcry against surveillance overreach, allowing it to grow almost unimpeded. As well, the positive effects can benefit some people, and their

negative effects are predominantly felt among those who, because of their economic situation, ethnic background or gender, are already disadvantaged.” (pp. 98–99). On the contrary, the increase in technological surveillance raises the issue of privacy, as well as the threat of discrimination. According to Haggerty and Ericson (2000) "Surveillance systems converge to form assemblages that extend monitoring across various aspects of social life, normalizing constant observation." (p. 610). To this end, the dual nature of technological surveillance as an instrument designed for safety and an instrument for control begs the need to examine the numerous effects of this phenomenon.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Surveillance has nowadays become an all-encompassing power that has a significant influence on controlling the behavior, socialization, and individual freedom of human beings. The technological development in the areas of communication, security, and convenience has however given an enabling environment to the massive surveillance of individual and group activities that have a toxic overreach on privacy and in some cases, can determine individual activities. The issues of the society are placed in the perspective through the literature, especially, dystopian fiction. In a novel *The Every* by Dave Eggers, he gives us a not-so-glamorous picture of technological surveillance and the effects of the surveillance on psychological, ethical, and societal levels. This paper examines the psychological and behavioral implications of this kind of technological monitoring as it is portrayed in *The Every*, specifically, how this impacts individual and collective agency and self-governance and how it influences the institutions of society.

---

<sup>7</sup>Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

<sup>8</sup>Lyon, D. (2018). *The culture of surveillance: Watching as a way of life*. Polity Press.

### **Significance of the Study**

As far as people who are from many disciplines like literature, psychology, and technology studies are concerned, this research is very crucial. In this study, the change is pushed further by using it to bridge the representative to the true psychoanalytic effect of technological surveillance in *The Every*. Society as a whole has always been one reflection of nascent and transformational, and ethical concerns it has had. Therefore, this study discusses the novel by Dave Eggers written on the building up the harsh critique of the modern digital surveillance culture and goes deeply into the damage that modern digital surveillance culture causes to human psychology, being able to think rationally and emotional healthiness. This research is built as a culturally hybrid method of literary analysis, psychological theorization, and use of empirical studies of surveillance, as a means to have a grip on the problems of the age of privacy, mental health, and digital control.

### **Delimitations of the research**

This study focuses on the portrayal of technology and surveillance in *The Every* by Dave Eggers, analyzing its psychological and behavioral impacts through Foucault's Panopticon and Zuboff's Surveillance Capitalism as theoretical frameworks.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study of *The Every* by Dave Eggers is performed and applied to critically examine the surveillance, technology and human autonomy issues in the book through the use of Panopticon framework by Michel Foucault and Surveillance Capitalism framework by Shoshana Zuboff. I apply the Foucault panoptic lens to understand how conduct is disciplined in the digital era not due to constant observation but on the foundation of constantly being under observation, and how on the premise of the Zuboff of how the tech corporations commercialize the human experience in a bid to make money they fashion behavior and mar the individual liberty. This machine is required so that one can apply the same to the fine's threads of power, control and surveillance in the story since *The Every* is an experimentation of how technology is government and social manipulation together. The chapter accumulates the ways rules of thumb become algorithmic governance, how opaque algorithms are influencing determination-making and making systemic biases, and whether this can be justified by the goodness, fairness, or democratic principles, or not. Moreover, a psychological impact of surveillance as anxiety, paranoia, and self-censorship is superimposed in a hyper-surveillance society, which what the characters of *The Every* are is experiencing. It would be my aim to hit the nail on the head between privacy and technological authority altogether and to make a correlation between literature research and the digital culture using comparative literature and real-life examples such as predictive policing and digital manipulation.

Living under the constant watch, increased anxiety, paranoia, and so-called self-censorship are very psychologically consequential. Scholars have addressed the negative effect of constant surveillance on mental health and human behavior at length. Also, in case individuals know that they are observed and each step is evaluated and penalized (Foucault, 1977).

---

<sup>9</sup>Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.)

Their behavior begins to be predetermined. Nevertheless, in the case of an anticipatory conformity in anticipation of the attitudes and behaviors that others adopt towards them, it is not only an individual adaptation, but also a tool of social control, which is systematic in confirming the dominant power (Lyon, 2018). Over time, the internalization of surveillance creates a cycle of psychological tension that propagates into the daily lives of the person due to being characterized by the state of constant anxiety and a sense of helplessness (Monahan, 2017).

The chilling effect as empirical research issue has turned into an effective one to comprehend the way online surveillance makes users act in an oblique manner. As Penney (2017) demonstrates, internet surveillance and self-regulation work as the chilling effect on certain individuals in their online daily lives, i.e., online activity is transformed or evaded in order to remain offline discussion and other activities which they know they might be observed doing. Such is one type of self-censorship that develops as a broader behavioral response to the fear of being spied on. Similarly in the same line, Fuchs (2017) affirms that social media sites also promote the behavioral dynamics towards what is perceived to be the social norms that guide the behaviors that are detrimental to the mental health. This performative effect is sometimes established in the virtual space, on the foundation of these constructed identities, constructed and sustained by the users of the places which construct

their online identity so as to become what they ought to be in real life. It may thus be applied to the self-surveillance which is a considered process of executing identities that are aligned with social norms, under algorithmic effects and social pressures; this is in line with the performativity theory by Butler (1990). These works taken collectively demonstrate how social conformity and surveillance produce and maintain a social environment whereby the behavior of one is mediated by external factors and therefore how one produces and reacts toward himself or herself. In *The Every*, the resolutions are made on the identity of the user in a surveilled society.

The chilling effect builds on the idea of internalization presented by Manokha (2018). It investigates the way, as a complement to their argument of internalized self-regulation in the context of digital surveillance.

---

<sup>10</sup> Lyon, D. (2018). *The culture of surveillance: Watching as a way of life*. Polity Press.

<sup>11</sup> Monahan, T. (2017). Regulating belonging: Surveillance, inequality, and the cultural production of abjection. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 10(2), 191–206.

<sup>12</sup> Penney, J. W. (2017). Internet surveillance, regulation, and chilling effects online: A comparative case study. *Internet Policy Review*, 6(2), 1–19.

<sup>13</sup> Fuchs, C. (2017). *Social media: A critical introduction* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

<sup>14</sup> Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

<sup>15</sup> Manokha, I. (2018). Surveillance, panopticons, and self-discipline in the digital age. *Surveillance & Society*, 16(2), 219–237.

Digital surveillance is made inconspicuous and omnivorous in a subtle way; it helps to self-regulate the behavior of the users. Control internalization also has significant psychological implications including anxiety, loss of autonomy and generation of replies to external social norms.

The same is echoed by Zuboff (2019) in *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* that companies employ extensive data-gathering tools in order to control the behaviors of their users to uphold a state of self-discipline under the rule of algorithms. In the same way, Lyon (2018) explains the operation of modern surveillance, stating that the main effect on subjects is to make them think that they are being observed, at the same time being unable to know what exactly they are observed. He points out that nowadays, surveillance is not merely a top-down process but also that individuals are self-surveilled and give social media as an example.

Such a dynamic assists in creating a culture where individuals alter their action by becoming visible so that none of their actions can be opaque as far as data collection processes are concerned. The dynamics of *The Every* are observed with a clear picture, which are characters constantly shifting their activities depending on the monitoring systems established by the company and which resemble the current-day anxieties over digital platforms creating self-censorship and behavioral conditioning.

### **Surveillance in the Workplace and Mental Health**

Eggers wastes much priority to concentrate on the effect of office surveillance on individual autonomy explaining the corporate culture of unremitting observation,

evaluating, and directing how the employees conduct themselves. Continuing this portrayal, Scholar, Kiziloglu (2018) indicates that the concept of workplace surveillance is connected with job stress and its adverse effects on the well-being of the employees in the actual world. Privacy and autonomy are also diminished through constant surveillance (which is negatively associated with lower performance as well as demoralizing). Apart from the adverse impact on employees' health (physical and mental), it also has reduced the good employee relationships at the workplace and organizational trust. However, his research shows that it is necessary to determine a balance in the monitoring practice so as not to do long-term damage to the employees' morale and productivity. Ajunwa, Crawford, and Schultz (2017) argue that advanced surveillance technologies can produce a milieu that makes people subject to company norms to the loss of their liberty and authenticity. There might be self-censorship and a reduction of truly work-related interactions in such an environment.

---

<sup>16</sup> Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

<sup>17</sup> Kiziloglu, M. (2018). Workplace surveillance, stress, and employee well-being. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 11(2), 123–137.

<sup>18</sup> Ajunwa, I., Crawford, K., & Schultz, J. (2017). Limitless worker surveillance. *California Law Review*, 105(3), 735–776

Data-driven evaluation systems in organizations like thrones of the workplace favor efficiency rather than creativity, and to the detriment of employees' wellbeing as Moore, Upchurch, and William (2018) indicated. The article provides possible reasons as to why such systems are not meant to assist in making the work environment more satisfying to work in or improve the mental health of employees due to strict measurements of performance which hinder the implementation of creative and intrinsic actions.

Holland, Cooper, and Hecker (2015) test the impact of Workplace Surveillance on employees' trust in management where being watched could erode psychological safety. But when employees are always monitored, they are not very willing to record their opinion of going outside the box just to avoid a snap and punishment. Specifically, it is shown in the study that innovation, among others, is suppressed in a hostile environment that is not conducive to positive workplace culture and in a surveillance-laden environment where trust is fragile build. Solove (2004) says since a citizen is always under surveillance, he/she will modify his behavior self-consciously and conform to normalcy because he/she realizes that he/she is under surveillance. As workers are identified in this new perspective, they are not encouraged to speak out and this greatly restrains their ability to be innovative and take creative risks in the fear of being attacked or criticized. Such an atmosphere does not encourage individual autonomy, who consequently cannot transfer their innovative idea soothe organization. Work place surveillance is frequently framed as work place surveillance improving employee well-being and productiveness.

The AI-based surveillance of the workplace is proving to be discriminative against the workers who are in precarious employment with low wages (The Inter faith Centeron Corporate Responsibility, 2024). Therefore, despite the technologies always being

performed in the perspective of the growing productivity, they have adverse effects on the vulnerable employees. The systemic labor force inequalities partially contribute to and sustain heightened surveillance, work intensification, diminished autonomy, deskilling, and deteriorating job quality. It is also the case that because low-wageworkers are less endowed, they are less secure and have fewer resources to resist these incursions.

---

<sup>19</sup>Moore, P. V., Upchurch, M., & Whittaker, X. (2018). *Humans and machines at work: Monitoring, surveillance and automation in contemporary capitalism*. Palgrave Macmillan.

<sup>20</sup>Holland, P., Cooper, B., & Hecker, R. (2015). Electronic monitoring and surveillance in the workplace: The effects on trust in management, and the moderating role of occupational type. *Personnel Review*, 44(1), 161–175.

<sup>21</sup>Solove, D. J. (2004). *The digital person: Technology and privacy in the information age*. New York University Press.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology refers to a systematic approach or the fundamental principles that guide the research process; it also refers to the processes and procedures that are followed when undertaking the research. It encompasses the methods, instruments, and processes involved in gathering, categorizing, examining, and explaining information to investigate a set of predetermined problems (Creswell, 2014). Not only does it explain what methods are involved, but it also provides a rationale of the method in relation to its linkages with the research paradigm, research objectives, philosophical assumptions used in the study; ontology, epistemology and axiology (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Since it ensures that studies are conducted in a valid, structured, and replicable framework within the adopted qualitative or quantitative approach, or a combination of both (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018).

In humanities and literature studies, one often presents to conduct research through the technique of qualitative approaches, where research on the texts, contexts, and cultural phenomena is explored via interpretative analysis, close reading, and critical theory (Hay, 2011).

### Methodology: Research Approach and Design

Methodology refers to every research design, inclination, methodology, and plans of data collection and analysis. The methodology of the study is qualitative, and the thematic elements of autonomy, surveillance, and technology are presented through a close reading of the text in a selective way considering the hermeneutic and interpretivist approach to literature analysis (Greenham D. 2019).

### Qualitative Design of Research

Through this approach, the present research enables the researcher to examine:  
The subjective experiences of characters within the narrative.  
The symbolic and thematic representations of surveillance and autonomy.

The social and ethical ramifications of technological control in society as portrayed in *The Every*.

Creswell (2018) further argues that, unlike other qualitative research methods, literary analysis aims to explore and comprehend the meaning of data attributed to individuals or groups concerning social or human problems. Therefore, it is an appropriate method for analyzing the multi-layered problems presented in a literary work.

This qualitative methodology naturally finds its place within the hermeneutic and interpretivist paradigms, as it involves the interpretation of text and the co-construction of meaning between text and reader.

---

<sup>22</sup> Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

<sup>23</sup> Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Sage Publications.

<sup>24</sup> Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

<sup>25</sup> Greenham, D. (2019). *Close reading: The basics*. Routledge.

To develop the research questions and construct a theoretical framework, the researcher selects *The Every* as the primary text. To assist in organizing thematic analysis, a close reading of the data is conducted using Greenham's (2019) six-context framework, which helps structure the analysis and examine the data in multi-dimensional ways.

This framework allows the researcher to critique the influence of modern society on both communities and individuals. The present work is well adapted to this qualitative method since it positions the thesis for a deep analysis of language, structure, and narrative technique as expressed in the novel, offering a richer understanding of its sociocultural implications.

### **Zuboff's Surveillance Capitalism and Behavioral Control**

The theorization of surveillance capitalism is introduced in Shoshana Zuboff's (2019) book *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*, as

An economic system where personal data is extracted and commodified for profit by corporations. The version of traditional capitalism is that of producing goods and services, and surveillance capitalism capitalizes on producing predictions of human behavior from harvesting and processing tons of data actively. For Zuboff, that will be a reversal of power. Included in this are the ones who use surveillance technologies to determine who makes the decisions for their lives, break privacy, and control what they are to do with or for a corporation who wishes to use surveillance technologies as a future means to achieve the corporation's ends.

Eggers's *The Every* functions as a novel in literary attack on surveillance capitalism, as we witness how they turn surveillance capitalism not only exponentially wider but also tame users' behavior. The novel presents *The Every* in which another huge tech company is watching them, expecting them to pick, think, and engage the way the company wishes. Zuboff's argument on surveillance capitalism as not only passive observation but active behavioral modification, *The Every* has continued with the tradition of predictive analytics regarding consumer choices, social interaction and work dynamics.

However, the commodification of personal information is the one that makes this

the timeliest which in most respects is what Zuboff is shouting out of the internet platforms that we use so freely when collecting as much useful information on our behalf (even to the point of touching it with actual fingertips) to cash in on. Eggers describes how humans willingly proceed with this system and never think of how much they get exploited. The trend of the characters development in the novel is leading to loss of autonomy where their preferences, their opinions, and their emotions are getting influenced by corporate algorithms aimed at delivering maximum engagement and profit.

---

<sup>26</sup> Greenham, D. (2019). *Close reading: The basics*. Routledge.

<sup>27</sup> Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

The *Every*, revolves around the illusion of choice, or people believing they have a choice when they are engulfed by surveillance capitalism that shapes the choices in secret manners. She says, Surveillance Capitalism is a description of a world in which you do not purchase a product, but rather, you are the product. (Zuboff,2024).

The *Every* is dependent on the framework of Zuboff in order to be able to perceive what are the ethical dilemmas that are brought forth in the play. The novelty of the novel is in the questions that are raised in the play in regard to the consent, agency, and the resistance of persons in a world where technological giants have never before been able to exercise control over the lives of individuals. Using the theory of Zuboff, this paper places the criticism of Eggers of a wider perspective on the totality of the effects of corporate domination through data, and the implications of the same to democracy, the rights of the citizen, and the well-being of the society.

## **DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Overview**

The *Every* (2021) and its psychological, behavioral, and social impacts on individuals and society as a result of technological surveillance are the subject of this chapter's analysis and discussion. The novel's critique of surveillance as the process of normalization and personal data as commodification in the consequences that it has on human autonomy, identity, and relationships is the subject of this chapter, which draws on Michel Foucault's Panopticon and Shoshana Zuboff's Surveillance Capitalism as its theoretical and conceptual framework. The researcher employs six levels/contexts of close reading, including semantic, syntactic, thematic, iterative, generic, and adversarial contexts, as outlined by Greenham (2019). The analysis identifies the prevailing digital control by examining the language, symbolism, and narrative structure of Eggers's writing. The *Every* is transformed into a critical report on contemporary fears of privacy, manipulation, and control as a result of the real-life analogies, such as surveillance in the workplace, predictive technologies, and the growing power of technology monopolies, that are connected to the imaginary reality of the novel under discussion. The analysis illustrates how characters are subjected to the constant gaze of observation, the regime of algorithmic governance, and so forth through crucial passages, thereby suggesting that surveillance has the potential to transform the human being and human society.

### **Analysis Structure**

The chapter proceeds in a logical approach to the analysis of certain significant passages of the novel, which relies on the six-contexts/levels of close reading model developed by Greenhand (2019), comprising of semantic, syntactic, thematic, iterative, generic, and adversarial contexts. Furthermore, it presents an alternative interpretation of all strata of the narrative by Eggers through the analysis of the specifics of the text, words, sentence structure, and the similarity of the themes.

---

28 Zuboff, S. (2024). *The age of surveillance capitalism* (Updated ed.). PublicAffairs.

29 Greenham, D. (2019). *Close reading: The basics*. Routledge.

### **AI and Technology: Surveillance of Corporates, Loss of Privacy and Conditioning of Behavior.**

#### **The Context of the Passage**

It is also then that the Every introduces Delaney to the hyper-surveilled world of the company. One of the employees who accompany her in the induction process is Kiki who informs her about the company procedures and how to behave. Delaney is influenced by the surreal policed corporate culture that comes before this scene. This culture has unwritten rules, which determine the mode of dressing and communicating. Further on, she narrates her second, first-hand, and personal encounter with the intrusive surveillance methods of The Every in one of the bathrooms, which is meant to be a personal space.

In the novel, the adjustment stage is already taking place as Delaney is monitored everywhere and she has to control herself. Very quickly, she discovers that the bathroom, where an artificial intelligence cartoon skunk monitors her and sets hygiene regulations, is not the place where she can escape the limelight. This scene also displays the fact that she does not appreciate the cultural part of the company since employees are perceived as data, behavioral objects and their activities are observed, discussed and corrected even in the tiniest features.

#### **TEXT**

She put the question, where is the restroom? Kiki brought her to a railing which was nearly twenty feet further on than the grass. The railing led to a spiraling staircase which led to an isolated and underground bath. Delaney hastened down its springy steps and threw open the door with a sigh. There was a voice, "Hello! Delaney! She had raised her head and a cartoon skunk was on the wall screen. The name of Delaney was seen in a wigwam-shaped bubble which was oozing out of the snout of the skunk. Please, tell me, whether there is anything I may be of service with.

Delaney entered the cubicle, shut the door and sat on the commode where he was dressing. She was eager to contact Wes hence made an attempt to clarify to her the details of the incidence that she witnessed and the body parts and the Lycra. She was not quite eager to do it, however, as she did not rely on the campus facilities, and she was also sure that she should be on the alert at any one moment. It was some time before she could meditate, bring the motion of her eyes under her control, and reflect on this. She rose from her seat.

That is all you are going to do, is it? asked the cartoon skunk. As this time, it stood on the door, and gazed away graciously. She replied, "No." Skunk pleaded with the human, do not keep me in a hurry! and took refuge behind a tree which was alive. (Eggers, 2021, p. 71).

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework. The theoretical and conceptual framework are implemented.

In the article, Surveillance Capitalism (2019) by Zuboff describes the way digital systems generate behavioral surplus to apply it in predictive analytics and behavior modification. One such case is the artificial intelligence skunk that is a real-life living creature that is intelligent and uses the behaviors of Delaney to enhance itself.

---

<sup>30</sup> Eggers, D. (2021). *The Every*, p. 71.

<sup>31</sup> Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

Surveillance capitalism uses human experience as the free raw material to be turned into behavioral information as unilateral as it was asserted by Zuboff who writes that this (surveillance capitalism) is its defining characteristic (Zuboff, 2019, p. 15). Even the loo trips as the one that Delaney made are subject to surveillance, and this confirms Zuboff when he says that the users are mere raw material to extract data, and not real customers. The AI skunk is a power instrumentation that manipulates the behavior rather than documents it like in the case of Delaney. On the one hand, surveillance capitalism is not just a question of determining the behavior of people, as it is described by Zuboff, but the question of determining the course of action that will probably be most suitable (Zuboff, 2019). Surveillance introduced in the novel due to AI can serve as a prototype of the subjugating effect of the people to interact with.

The Panopticon by Michel Foucault defines power as a system of self-controlling that is premised upon the all-time surveillance. The AI skunk is performing Foucault in the lavatory as he made the room a panoptic space by stating that, visibility was a trap and Visibility is a trap (Foucault, 1977, p. 200). She changes her action because she is afraid of appearing to be more naturalistic since she is aware that she is being observed. In such a sense, it is internalized surveillance in the meaning which Foucault puts forward, what is the primary impact of the Panopticon is to provide a circumstance of conscious and unremitting visibility in the inmate which puts pressure on power to operate automatically (Foucault, 1977, p. 201). The skunk does not have to exercise his power, since the AI must not only keep a watch, but to simply drown in order to prevent an overt punishment. The skunk thus contributes to the surveillance that is inevitable. By alignment it is highlighted that perfection of power must have a predisposition of making its actual practice redundant (Foucault, 1977, p. 201). That the control exist is sufficient to bring about compliance is sufficient to indicate that the most effective control is the internalized rather than the monitored one.

### **Critical Analysis of Greenham on the 6 contexts.**

#### **Semantic Context**

In the semantic context, the researcher is concerned with the numerous layers of meanings, which words and phrases bear that are ascribed to the overall meaning of a text. In the following part, there would be three primary methods of establishing semantic context of a word. (Greenham, 2019, p. 36)

Situational semantics seeks to reflect a computer program or a method using a context environment.

The definition of words depends on the context of the situation. The question Is that it? is a neutral question, which the speaker answers in order to identify the fact whether somebody has fulfilled his/her work or not. The following is one of the general illustrations of the text. The mentioning of this neutral question by AI is intrusive in a monitored loo.

---

<sup>32</sup> Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs, p. 15.

<sup>33</sup> Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books, p. 200, 201.

<sup>34</sup> Greenham, D. (2019). *Close reading: The basics*. Routledge P. 36.

The encroachment by the word completed in this case is that it traditionally signifies completed and it would signify time watching. The application of the first person plural and first-person singular pronouns hints that the surveillance has a totalitarian and individualistic nature. In this case the meaning of this question will be determined by the context of the situation that reveals the critique of Eggers on corporate surveillance masqueraded as assistance.

### **Semantic context of History.**

Restroom is the word that displays the historical evolution of the privacy, that is, it was converted into the uncontrolled zone and became the controlled one.

The setting of this study is Figurative Semantics.

The provision is the delusion of privacy. behind a tree in animation the skunk concealed himself. The AI will also appear to take a back seat and continue to spy as was the case with the technology firms that offer fake privacy choices when collecting information. Eggers is referring to the authority that the consumers have in the shape of a mere corporate tracking.

### **Syntactic Context**

The periodic sentence is employed in the text so that the suspense is created and the main clause is underlined by stressing paranoia which is developed by Delaney towards his own surveillance. She was thrilled to have contact with Wes but she was hesitant to have contact with him because she did not trust the bathrooms at the campus and she felt that she should be on her beams at all times.

### **Thematic Context**

The text is dedicated to the deprivation of privacy as even bathrooms were not safe to be monitored. The AI skunk is intrusive and the corporate control is formed, and is more than helpful, at least in the case of the reinforcement of the corporate control. Consequently, Delaney will be able to manage her behavior.

### **General Context**

One of the aspects of the text is the encroachment and annihilation of personal privacy by companies, and it fits the dystopian literature. Another fantastic commentary on genre criticism of technology-as-control, as *Brave New World* and *1984*, is the skunk in the AI suit. The satirical aspect of the novel, Iterative Context, is an example of how corporations have been able to frame surveillance as helpful and the reason why we should be concerned with the unrestricted liberation that technology has.

The AI skunk which repeats the monologues, e.g. Did I get you? or because he always asks, are you concluded? Presents the continuous surveillance with some support of computerized interactions.

### **Adversarial Context**

The text is connected with the larger cultural, social, and political discourse on how corporations are controlled, privacy and surveillance. This text of law inveigates most of the corporate spying, behind-the-scenes power, and how this world deprives people of the privacy, and it identifies the moral nature of the modern technology. The Every is an element of a larger discourse on the ethical side of technology in the contemporary world, which the majority of the corporations are hesitant to speak about.

### **Textual Context (Co-Text)**

The author indeed gives a personification to the AI skunk in the text that can be likened to the real-life Alexa, Siri, etc. They are even attractive yet they are gathering user information. The novel reaches even the repressed surveillance that is concealed under the name of AI support.

It is easy to detect the situation at the first sight.

The idea of CCTV, Biometric, and artificial intelligence surveillance in a work place, and others is a brilliant comparison to the surveillance of the self-control of Delaney that demonstrates that it is significant to keep a watch on a space all the time.

### **Social/Broader Context**

The text brings out the business implications of information collection and loss of privacy on the internet. It reminds the real-life debate of the legal facet of surveillance and rectitude of AI that justifies surveillance on the basis of security and betrays the privacy of the individuals.

### **Re-entry Situational Background**

It is also connected with dystopian literature, such as 1984 and Brave New World, and Surveillance Capitalism by Zuboff literally demonstrates that we are now the subjects of the apparently irreversible data mining of the World Wide Web.

### **ANALYSIS**

Another symbol of the AI and the unseen surveillance, a skunk also triggers the conditioning of behavior and is presented in the 1984 and Brave New World. The novel also contains Shoshana Zuboff surveillance capitalism and Michel Foucault panopticons as it is a proper representation of both. The Every is, after all, an example of what the future of the lack of the concept of privacy will bring and how humans will become commodities in a world of unending surveillance and control.

### **THE negative impact of Surveillance on the Interaction between humans.**

#### **The Context of the Passage**

The passage occurs at the point when Delaney begins to discover that TruVoice is a highly sophisticated AI platform, which not only logs and analyzes spoken words but also in real-time. Already before this point, she had been assimilated into the culture of hyper surveillance that The Every is, but here she realizes that it is not just her speech that is being listened to, but it is also being processed, analyzed and stored.

That Delaney makes an effort to speak to Wes without uttering a word, with opened eyes, she tried to explain to Wes that something was starting, which shows that she changes her behavior and, accordingly, adapts the communication in a world where verbal communication is no longer assumed. In the beginning, Wes responds to Delaney in an uncovered manner and is completely unaware of the whole implication. But this, proved, as the statement indicates, she is compelled to say something artificial and forced to warn him, and this is the case when she said, she fixed her mouth into a terrible smile. This is used to demonstrate the paranoid state that she finds herself in and how she would have preferred to conceal her real intentions in the mind of corporate onlookers.

In the past, Delaney has already discovered that The Every's surveillance is perpetual; however, in this instance, it is unavoidable and impinges on her capacity to communicate freely. In essence, this is a critical realization; surveillance is not only present in the world, but it is also influencing the way in which individuals think, act, and convey their emotions.

#### **Text**

“Delaney had a thought. With widened eyes, she tried to convey to Wes that something was beginning and that he needed to pay attention. “What?” he said, looking around. “What’s happening? Is something happening?” She fixed her mouth into a terrible smile. He took the hint. She assumed their words were being recorded and screened, in real-time, by TruVoice.” (Eggers, 2021, p. 152).

### **Theoretical and Conceptual Framework Application**

In her book *Surveillance Capitalism*, Zuboff proposes that today's corporations are leveraging the AI system to extract predictive data out of mere human activity. This is precisely what TruVoice is, as it is a predictive surveillance tool (real-time speech monitoring) that dictates one's behavior before one has even acted. Eggers mocks things like sentiment analysis and uses of AIs like surveillance which allow a person to control the population before effecting, rather than being confronted with the action of crushing dissent without warning. As Zuboff states, "Surveillance capitalism unilaterally claims human experience as free raw material for translation into behavioral data" (Zuboff, 2019, p. 94). The automatization of Delaney's and Wes's words, tone, and emotions that have been stripped of their privacy serves to commodify their interactions and emotions and reduce their capacity to be expressions of self in a world of automation.

Contrary to Michel Foucault's Panopticons, power works best when individuals put knowledge and awareness of being observed into practice without it being psychologically intrusive, which leads to self-regulation. Whenever under watch by TruVoice, Delaney and Wes naturally adjust their speech to self-regulate. Embodying Foucault's assertion that "The major effect of the Panopticon is to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (Foucault, 1977, p. 201). TruVoice functions as a digital Panopticon, where visibility itself becomes a means of control "Visibility is a trap" (Foucault, 1977, p. 200). Though no one has a physical enforcer, compliance persists because of a fear of being watched. As Foucault further notes, "The perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary" (Foucault, 1977, p. 201). This is to illustrate how TruVoice implements governance not by direct action. Internalizing the embeddedness of the presence of surveillance, people preemptively confirm, displaying how the systems managed through AI are built to reinforce control through omnipresence.

### **Close Reading Analysis of the Passage from *The Every***

#### **Semantic Context**

First, the researcher will analyze the two words independently, specifically "widened" and "screened". Each one's meaning furthers the text.

#### **Situational Context**

The character Wes looked over at Delaney; her widened eyes told him to watch out. The word widened indicated that she could not speak freely under surveillance or that her words were not just recorded but filtered by TruVoice.

#### **Historical Semantic Context**

In old times, the word recorded represented physically recording details, like writing on a piece of paper or magnetic tape.

#### **Figurative Semantics Context**

The exact meaning of the word written is to snatch a piece of information which can be utilized later on the date. However, the text goes beyond the document and acquires its figurative meaning of surveillance, control and loss of freedom.

#### **Syntactic Context**

The broken sentence, What? ... What's happening? Something happening? is indispensable in the exhibition of the panic, paranoia and break of normal communication in the face of surveillance. The sudden sentence, the one-word question Who? and incompleteness of thought leave the reader in disorientation and a sense of urgency.

#### **Thematic Context**

The impossibility of avoiding TruVoice monitoring is what results in self-censorship of communication and forms the lack of autonomy. Wes displays confusion, and this confusion is a sign of paranoia and mistrust whereby surveillance influences behaviors and results in self-regulation even when an individual would prefer to be alone.

### **Generic Context**

The text is an example of dystopian fiction because technology becomes normalized to spy on people and limit autonomy. The Every is similar to 1984 in that it concerns the corporate control of speech whereby TruVoice dictates instead of merely listening. Satire reveals how surveillance is sold so effectively that it is embedded in emotions of obedience. This dystopian and satiric fusion of conventions reveals the role of technology in the contemporary world in criticizing the growing power of technology over how people think and communicate.

### **Iterative Context**

This is shown in the passage through repetition in dialogue, behavior, and surveillance to demonstrate the state of a character permanently on the wrong side of the microscope. Wes keeps on asking the question What? ... What's happening? Is something happening? This implies paranoia and disturbed communication. The repetitive use of nonverbal cues by Delaney perpetuates her self-censorship. The corporate rule of the novel is reflected in the passage by the fact that speech is never free. Surveillance makes self-regulation a habit due to its normalization.

### **Adversarial Context**

The passage takes on the issues of surveillance, privacy, and corporate rule of AI techniques being used to surveil speech and to shape and control behavior the real world is facing.

### **Textual Context**

It is a voice recognition program known as TruVoice that is used to screen and record real time speech. It articulates the dystopian futures like in the case of 1984 that suggests that language must be monitored so as to police thought and action.

### **Immediate Obvious Context.**

The symptoms of modern anxiety concerning the surveillance on the Internet are self-censorship and paranoia of Delaney and Wes. The modern concern is that one is filtering messages at school, at work, on forums, and on the streets and thinks twice before something makes it to the trash or whether one should report it to the boss or the police.

### **Social/Broader Context**

The passage is concerned with corporate ownership of the freedom of expression, which in current practice is rampant in regards to AI censorship, speech regulation, and data privacy, a kind of control being exercised by means of the application of big tech as an algorithmic filter of discourse.

### **Re-Entre Textual Context**

It is related to modern-day commentary on the issue of surveillance capitalism such as *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* by Zuboff (2019) concerning the manner in which individuals are manipulated to willingly give up their actions when they are subjected to constant monitoring by means of electronic means.

### **ANALYSIS**

Fragmented monologue What? is similar to the Orwell 1984 in which the language was altered to be manipulated. In this case, TruVoice is not only observing the discussion, but defining it, describing how AI controls the behavior prior to its occurrence. The enhancement of this conditioning is achieved with repetition that becomes apparent when Delaney does not utter a word, and Wes is baffled by how people inherently regulate themselves when digitally monitored.

The text resembles Zuboff Surveillance Capitalism because AI turns human behavior into foreseeing data, and gradually conditions human beings to conformity and restriction of resistance. Besides, Foucault in his Panopticism employs the surveillance to produce discipline through making visible and as a result, conformity is created without any intervention. TruVoice serves as a digital Panopticon, making it so that even without actual surveillance, people self-regulate because they fear they may be observed. This proves that autonomy falls victim when surveillance becomes normal and eventually internal as something inevitable.

### **CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents the resultant critical elaboration and synthesis of the core findings, which is founded on the literature study conducted on the novel, *The Every* by Dave Eggers. The analytic exploration of the radical change of personal experience of the overwhelming surveillance technology due to the loss of the personal privacy, and its psychological consequences are complicated by the immoral consequences in the general sense. As it does it is prudently, Eggers reveals the fact that in its final glimpse of the dystopian it is the subversion of technology that has torn even the most intimate of aspects of human life to which one would want to retire. The outcomes of this discussion have implied that not only are there factors of character in the story which are being showing some signs of anxiety and self-censoring, but they have also produced identity issues, since they are being continually observed and observed. These conclusions confirm the premise of concern expressed in the theory of surveillance capital by Shoshana Zuboff, i.e., economic exploitation of personal data as a means of economic exploitation. These meanings are also completely on the same page with Michel Foucault Panopticons in the sense that the all-pervasive eyes resulting in surveillance create discipline in that they internalise discipline and thus they do not create discipline in their own behaviours subconsciously. The production is a fateful, yet educative, illustration of the course of modernity into unmatched openness with the disappearance of autonomy and genuine self-possession into total emptiness. This is all merely to increase the feeling of the necessity of imperative notice and of the moral consideration of the ubiquitous systematization of the methods of surveillance into the round of the everyday.

### **Key Findings**

As an analysis, it talked about the highly invasive surveillance techniques in the story by giving two examples: the skunk of AI and TruVoice. Yet these are no more than decorated technologic archetypes; within them, one can trace Egger's rejection of that free-wheeling business and the way in which it makes the matter of self-determination trivial.

The digital age normalizes and internalizes surveillance; this is notably so with communication in virtue of transparencies. As per these terms, the cases are an expression of the theory of surveillance capitalism by Shoshana Zuboff, where personal parts of human life are taken, sold and used as corporate capital to make money alone, without consent. In addition, it is analogous to that of Michel Foucault in the fact that there is the promise of continuous surveillance of the individuals that would train them to be docile and compliant to the society. Collectively, these moments enhance the manner by which, within Eggers, the digital control mechanisms are handled that endeavor to alter the boundary of individual liberty.

The study proved the extent to which conditions of surveillance are prevalent in conditioning the individuals to self-censorship, obedience and conforming to behavior above all, in the development of internalized Delaney fear and self-control. Consequently, she is never unaware that she is being noticed and thus a deeper compliance and unconscious transformation do happen as she creates a psychological response to anticipating getting noticed and literally responds in advance to this, actions and thoughts. With this said, since the behavior is far more appropriate to the concept of internalized disciplinary power and control which is inside the psyche of the individual rather than external to a person, this is all perceived to be in line with what Michel Foucault refers to as disciplinary power. The potential of being observed, even

though not a prerequisite of conformity, definitely induces an ill psychological effect and the fact that Delaney is anxious, emotionally withdrawn and changed in his relations with others are all results of this state. The text Underline in the character of her the infrastructures of digital surveillance not only monitor but also structure and control the interior life of individuals and establish a culture of compliance that renders on fear and uncertainty.

In the direction of the advancement of the society, Eggers proposes that surveillance technology is unethically altering behavior into control mechanisms of the individual. Nevertheless, as a safety instrument, transparency and efficiency such technologies are a way of making the application of invasive surveillance a norm, and annihilating the opportunity of the individual to make free and uninfluenced choices. This is in response to the prevailing warning that corporations, in the pretext of consent, are misusing personal data in their own devious unscrupulous interests under very secretive control schemes. Eggers so by bringing such a concern into the novel; this contrasts the initiative of unrestricted surveillance Capitalism, trade of Private Corporations mining and making a gain on people experience without any hint of remorse and how it manipulates its user's behavior in the best interest of business. Thus, by doing so, the novel condemns.

The morality of technological excess is debatable but there is also a warning that democratic values and a free society in which everything is manipulated by data logics and algorithmic powers are gradually being chipped away.

### **Discussion**

The narrative by Eggers goes along with the assumption by Shoshana Zuboff that surveillance capitalism robs people of their experience and transforms it into information about their behavior that can be sold to people to make a profit even during the most intimate episodes of the lives of individuals. By the use of machines that are expected to provide individuals with some degree of freedom, yet in reality are harnessing technology through automated tracking, analysis, and prediction of individual behavior, Eggers reveals how freedom is being destroyed in the novel. At the same time, the predictive algorithms predestine characters before the watchful eye and at the same time result in the habituation, socialization and self-selected characters who, as per their own prescription, make decisions between the various actors. It is a state where human beings are getting more passive because their performance is predetermined by structures that permit conformity and engagement. What the narrative does reveal, then, is the unhealthy but rather secretive nature of the online adventure. Eggers exaggerates these processes in order to answer the burning question about ethical applications of predictive analytics processes and the social implications in the long-term concerning the potential of corporate organizations to make their judgements about human behavior on the basis of data systems.

Foucault, in his metaphor of panopticism, is driven to considerably bigger extremes by Every, even than the domain of constant, even implicit surveillance, is turned into the engine of internalized control. In the novel we have observed that behavior does not change because people are forced to change but that in their hearts, they feel that they are being watched everywhere. According to Foucault, power is only perfect when it is internalized to the point where we can control ourselves according to what we consider the norms and expectations. The Every is not an allusion to the reality that these guys are literally being trailed along the street, but the power of surveillance is compelling them to be merely not daring enough to be otherwise to fit in, not because they are under surveillance, but because the simulacrum of their hearts is under surveillance. Although the novel best-seller is speculative fiction, and the most impressive of its effects are cautionary, this is critical, cultural and even ethical analysis: a critique of the degree to which such procedures of surveillance cut to the quick, even strip away our most basic humanity. Eggers puts the social and psychological cost of life that exists under constant examination into hand so as to attract further attention to the hyper convenience that

digital fusion makes possible, and the data corporation that is unchained. The novel contains a great number of ethical questions that go beyond the scope of fiction and that demand the involvement of the reader in a dispute between the significance of a contemporary technological course of development.

### **Literary Contributions**

This piece of literature goes one step further in the discussion of how *The Every* and other dystopian modernists makes us realize the criticism of technology and the complacency of our technology-enabled world. The paper places Eggers novel in the huge dystopian tradition of global panic in response to the unchecked growth of digital surveillance and corporate domination. In such a way, it restates the continuing role of literature as an approach to critique the ethical, psychological and political dimensions of our modern technological existence and not just reflect them. The research contributes to the validation of the role of the literary studies in the legitimate issues and make people aware of the criticality of the interactions of control in the contemporary world of rapid technological progress.

### **Limitations**

To some degree, interpretative subjectivism is present in literary analysis since its generalizations rely on close reading and on theoretical (as opposed to empirical) framing. Of course, it is entirely natural that the interpretation by one reader or scholar will not be the same as that of another one, but a subjectivity will certainly provide richness and depth that is required. Lastly, the analysis is founded on a single text, *The Every*, and therefore limits the application of the findings to other dystopic texts or even actual life circumstances. The empirical evidence is even less and, therefore, does not allow drawing the parallels between the actual world and the measurable information that would develop a fiction connecting the contemporary ideas of surveillance to the real world rather than the imaginary. But against them is the central purpose of the study that, through the creative medium of fiction, seeks to note the counter-cultural and psychological the features of surveillance but not to come up with any certain conclusion about the technological reality.

### **Future Research**

Besides, the project would serve as a foundation to conduct additional comparative literary studies on dystopian literature that address the issue of technological power and surveillance. A bigger corpus would also allow superior and more comprehensive comprehension of how other writers and different types of narrative background conceive and critique various components of digital power structure. Differences and ideological contradiction or cultural specificity of particular issues in the genre may also be discovered in such a comparison. Second, empirical research on the topic, whether conducted by psychologists, sociologists or media studies, would allow the insights of the literature to be polished through studies of the objective psychological and social effect of surveillance in the modern social reality.

### **Conclusion**

This paper critically examined the effects of surveillance technology in *Every* by Eggers in relation to human behavior, autonomy of individuals, and social norms. During the research process, it arrived at the idea of modern panoptic literature by merging the panoptic idea of Foucault and Zuboff's surveillance capitalism, the inner workings, thinking, social relations by exploring digital surveillance. The study findings are concerned with the relevance of literature in investigating the novelty of emerging technological trends and the necessity to comprehend them appropriately. The paper warns that government surveillance should be regarded as a potent tool of routinization of risk because it is a skillful way of maintaining the subject as a psychological, social and cultural target.